

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for January 1973

CARDINAL WRIGHT SPEAKS

DEMOCRACY AND THE CHURCH

The Editor

THE TAX CREDIT SYSTEM

J. M. Jackson

EDUCATION: THE NEED
FOR AUTHORITATIVE TEACHING

Guy Brinkworth, S.J.

REASON FOR HOPE

Paul Crane, S.J.

READINGS AT MASS

Francis Fenn, S.J.

v. 14

1973

January Renewers

are asked to be so kind as to renew their subscriptions without delay. There are approximately 600 subscriptions due for renewal in December and 300 in January; nearly 900, which is close to one-third of the total circulation of the magazine. It is this that gives prompt renewal in these two months its special significance — once they are cleared and well cleared the finances of *Christian Order* have a secure base for yet another year. December renewers have been magnificent. January subscribers are asked to be so good as, please, to follow suit. All subscriptions to Rev. Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London, SW1V 2BG. A subscription costs £1. Notes are entirely acceptable.

Contents

Page

- 2 REASON FOR HOPE
The Editor
- 4 CARDINAL WRIGHT SPEAKS
- 26 READINGS AT MASS
Francis Fenn, S.J.
- 29 DEMOCRACY AND THE CHURCH
The Editor
- 41 THE TAX CREDIT SYSTEM
J. M. Jackson
- 51 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.
- 56 BOOK REVIEW

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

356335

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 14

JANUARY 1973

NUMBER 1

Reason for Hope

THE EDITOR

THE feeling has been about for some time that the tide in the Church's affairs is close to the turn. The watershed, I believe, was last March when the petulant manifesto of thirty-three theologians, calling for resistance to authority within the Church, fell like a damp squib amongst the Faithful. The reaction it evoked from them could be described without exaggeration as at zero level. Even the sillies remained for the most part unmoved or else afraid, once they saw which way the wind was blowing. When this happened one knew the game was up. The thesis had been nailed to the door with a great bang; and nobody even bothered to study it. It was enough to know its signatories and the general trend of their message to treat it with the contempt it deserved. For the most part, none were bothered and rightly so. Arrogance — and the blindness that goes with it — is only too obvious to all but the arrogant. *The coup de grace* came in April when the Secretary to the International Theological Commission, Father Philip Delahaye, took the dissident theologians over a barrel in the *Osservatore Romano*.

Things have quickened since then. The pop theologians are talking much less. It could be that even they have been brought to the realization that very few of the Faithful have the least interest in what they have to say. The reason

is simple enough. A great deal of what they say is without sense and, very often, in contradiction or query of ancient truth. How can their petty, strident and often ill-informed these compare with the magnificent stuff of yesteryear? An American friend of mine went recently into the best known Catholic bookshop in London and asked what people were reading. The answer came at once — the best of yesterday. Neither the new mod theology, nor the latest in liturgical gymnastics; not Sister Twinkletoes on *Christ is Community* nor Father Puffadder on *God is People*, but books on Our Lady and the Saints and popular devotions and, of course, the great Catholic classics of those “appalling” triumphalists, Chesterton and Belloc. All those “dreadful” things like simple prayer books, statues — yes, statues — and, Heaven preserve us, rosary beads and holy water stoups and candles — all that kind of “superstitious nonsense” was being bought. To which I say, Praise the Lord and perish all progressives. What a silly lot they are in their pathetic and untutored arrogance.

Next month under the general title of “The Dutch Sedition”, we shall begin publishing the observations of an English Catholic lady, who has spent the last eleven years in Holland. She has been through it all and seen it all. Angela Meyrick writes with balance and perception. Very kindly she has placed at the Editor’s disposal her written notes and comments over eleven years, the whole of the period of the Dutch Catholic crisis. What they confirm is what many of us have thought; that the attempted destruction of Dutch Catholicism has been to no small extent, the work of subversives, who have permeated the Church in Holland at all levels, particularly, perhaps, those of religious life. Their seditious activity, combined with episcopal weakness that can only be described as appalling, has flattened the Dutch Church, but it has not crushed it. This is what comes out of Angela Meyrick’s articles. The great body of the Faithful, with a lacing of fine priests, have stood firm in Holland. They have refused to go under. They have saved the Church.

Below we print the agreed text of the address given by Cardinal John Wright, in the presence of Archbishop Cowderoy, to an audience of a thousand priests on June 9th, 1972 at the Bishop Thomas Grant Comprehensive School, Streatham, London. The Cardinal's words were received with marked enthusiasm. Careful readers of what he had to say will understand why. It could well be that history will look back on this occasion last June as something of a watershed, a dividing line between bogus attempts in the field of catechetics since the Council, and those which are genuine and true. We are very grateful to the Cardinal for permission to publish his speech.

Cardinal Wright Speaks

I WELCOME a chance to talk about the most important work of the Congregation in the Roman Curia to which the Holy Father has been kind enough, or reckless enough, to appoint me as Prefect. It happens also to be in my judgment, the most important work in the Church today, and I justify that seemingly audacious remark by saying that I personally cannot think of a single problem facing the Catholic Church, the solution of which does not depend on how well you do the work I am talking about tonight.

Crisis in Catechetics

If you were to name the problem you consider the chief problem, I suppose you might say it was the problem of vocations. Well, you'll get no vocations unless this work is done. Or you might say the chief problem is that of family life. You won't have any families unless this work

is done, so there won't be any problem of family life except the non-existence of the Christian family. You might say peace and war, or something vertical or horizontal, whatever the phrases are these days, but *this* work is the work of teaching the Faith revealed in, through, and by Christ Jesus, who died for our salvation on a cross. That cross is the symbol of the Church. It's both vertical and horizontal, and if you take away the vertical staff the horizontal one falls to the ground. Remind the horizontal-church boys of that the next time they ask you why you are not in the "horizontal Church", to the exclusion of the "vertical Church" that they so resent.

In a word, then, the present crisis is a crisis in a complicated word called "catechetics", the teaching of the Faith, not a theory about the Faith, or comparative religion, but the Faith. I will never be able to figure out why the holy Catholic Church, the truths of which are the simplest in the history of the world, has managed to pick out the most complicated words to describe them — but isn't it true? We wrap it all up in a mystery. The fact of the matter is we're talking tonight about the crisis in catechetics: the *teaching of the Faith*. By the way, we are not talking about *theology*; I'd like to emphasise that point. Its perfectly possible to have the Faith and know as little about theology as my mother did. You well remember Louis Pasteur, who said that if it came to a choice between having the faith of a whole faculty of theologians and that of a Breton peasant, he preferred the latter. Faith saves; theology is a kind of science (we'll come to that later), but they are not the same thing.

Faith is not Theology

Now there are undoubtedly some and many distinguished theologians in the hall tonight and they are going home as indignant as blazes with me because they are going to say I sneered at the theologians. But if you'd give us a hand and do the proper work of a theologian, I'd embrace you and kiss you. All I am asking you to do is

not replace the Faith with your theology; that's all. The Faith is revealed by Jesus Christ, theology was dreamed up by you. Faith is a total personal response to the word of God, speaking through Jesus Christ. Theology is some smart guy putting out a scientific systematization of his opinion about the matter and how he explains it to himself (*if he does*).

But we just touch on this in a glancing fashion. All I am saying is that what with one thing and another, there exists in the world considerable confusion at the moment about catechetics; about what precisely is the Faith and how it should be transmitted. Remember the old phrase, "The Faith transmitted to our Fathers"; "Faith of our fathers living still". The Faith of our fathers was transmitted by the mandate of God, through the word of Jesus to the Apostles and their accredited representatives, and those to whom their accredited representatives gave the faculty to perpetuate the Faith. Some of them were theologians and some of them weren't. I have known several bishops in my life who weren't great theologians. I know one bishop who is a much better real estate man than he is a theologian, *but he has the Faith*. Perhaps that's what scares the real estate broker because he does not know what the power of it may be. The bishop knows he has the angels on his side; by the way, he believes in angels! So does the real estate broker when this bishop is around! Well, there is a crisis: What is the Faith and how are we going to teach it? This crisis has been a long time coming on — so long that I could talk to you for six hours and a half on how it came about, but I am going to abbreviate it briefly lest you get into an even worse crisis.

A Cultural Revolution

First of all, I have a theory that this crisis began not with a crisis in faith. I have had lots of fellows come in to me — seminarians, priests and others — saying "I'm suffering from a crisis in the Faith" — and after a few

minutes conversation you discover that they're not having a crisis in the Faith at all. They have very profound faith. They have a crisis of a theological kind. They can't quite understand Hans Kung or someone like that, but it isn't a crisis in the Faith. More often than not I believe at any rate (this is purely personal and I offer it merely as such) that they are suffering from a crisis in *culture*. We are undergoing one of those great cultural revolutions which occur every four or five hundred years in history. For example, even I can remember when England was a liberal arts country. They taught Latin, English, History, including American history (badly rewritten but nonetheless they taught it); they had what you call *liberal-arts* minds. Now liberal arts are a classical education and produce a certain kind of intellect. Cardinal Newman had it. Can you imagine him suffering a crisis of faith? He did not split infinitives nor theological hairs. His mind was clear. He had read the Greek fathers; he knew how it all seemed to the fathers of the Church when the Church was young. He had read the Latin fathers. He had read the Faith of our Fathers as Christ revealed it.

This evening I entered this school where I am speaking and I kidded the headmaster; "I see that even you have gone technocratic; you're computerised". There's a huge board out front which tells where everybody is every minute. It's something like the space ships. There's a fellow down in Houston (Texas) who knows where the astronauts are all the time. The astronauts don't know! The astronauts are part of the machinery, because ours is no longer a liberal arts, intellectual, personal, free-will civilisation; it's an automated, technological, scientific, mechanical civilization — and you'd better get used to it or you're going to be run over the next time you cross the street and you're going to get your hand caught in the machinery. In a period of such crisis, when suddenly everybody is studying space mathematics and all manner of so-called positive sciences are taking over, and poetry is disappearing from the schools, and theatre (except in

regrettable forms) and no one remembers ancient history, and they all have nervous fits every morning when they read in the headlines that finally, after six years of debate the Irish have joined the European market; and they forget that it took 250 years to form the Peloponnesian League (which is about one-eighth the size of the European market) . . . you see they have lost perspective and sight of the clear stars by which we must set our course, including the fixed stars of the Faith which survive occasional theological clouds of smog. The machinery has their poor little heads pounding; so, they have gone into what I think is a *cultural* crisis.

Crisis in the Faith

A like thing happens with the Faith. The moment there is a crisis in the Faith, you get an epidemic of theologians! To explain it, they start off with a theology called the theology of "God is Dead". That's not Faith; it's a theology (as a matter of fact it's a lie). Or, even worse, they begin to show, even on Catholic book stalls, not books about Faith, Hope and Charity, but books entitled "*Towards a Theology of Hope*". Two thousand years after Calvary, what in the name of heaven does that title mean? "*Towards a Theology of Community*" — two thousand years after the Cenacle and the Last Supper! *Towards a* theology of this, and *towards a* theology of that — they are what they call *searching*. All this means is that in the crisis of Faith they have lost their way in the fog and thumb a ride from any guy driving along.

The last great crisis of this kind came, I suppose, in Europe with the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. All of a sudden the best part of a thousand years of Christian unity in the Faith was challenged by the revival of classical learning. Just as people say now, "I don't go in for that early twentieth-century religious art", so then, they said "I go in for Greek and Roman art", and we were

flooded with Greek and Roman art — Michaelangelo, Bramante — and you'll never catch me saying it isn't great art, but it came to the people as a kind of shock. Then there came the Enlightenment, the Encyclopaedists, the new learning and the new wisdom. Many of your best men died victims of it, fighting for the old learning. One was Thomas More. He continued to write in Latin. But this tradition was *not* the Faith. You must not confuse *culture* and *Faith*. Belloc did that: "The Faith is Europe and Europe is the Faith". There was never a more silly line uttered. Europe is *not* the Faith. I can be a witness to that. I have been in Europe. I have also met magnificent Catholics in Taipei and Taiwan, and they had never seen the Eifel Tower or Notre Dame, or things we think of as representative of Western Culture, which is what Belloc had in mind. There was a great period of crisis, and out of it there came a flood of theologians. It's unecumenical to mention their names now, but nonetheless they flooded that particular period. There's a monument to them in Geneva; they're all made out of marble and they stand in a park staring at you. One morning I got out at 7 o'clock and stood in front of the Reformation monument, and there were all these great theologians staring at me. You know what they were thinking? They were thinking, "You are a Roman Catholic. You've just got off the aeroplane from Rome and I bet you played bingo last night"!

A New Synthesis

So, there was this little transition; first a crisis of culture, then a crisis of belief and then a flood of theology. Then it settled down a bit because there came a *synthesis*; the new love for old beauty, for classical art, entered the service of the Church and the Faith. There came the Industrial Revolution, and that caused a very great crisis, both in your country and mine, as you can tell whenever you read between the lines of Dickens and when you read about the terrible losses among the immigrants to my own country. Then in God's providence, this new learning,

sometimes even the new theology, and the new culture synthesized with the ancient Faith (because the Faith never actually died) and there came the Faith lived out; the same Faith, lived out in new forms.

Testimony of the Astronauts

So the Faith is going through a crisis; but the synthesis of the Faith and the new challenge is already under way. Let me give you a proof. What is the highest possible symbol of the new science, the new technology? Just as in the age of the classical renaissance you would have chosen a great painter or a great sculptor, so today you would choose a great technologist, a great technocrat — let's say an astronaut. He is the symbol of the new science, isn't he? But did you notice then when the astronauts were orbiting the moon on the Eve of Christmas four years ago they read to the entire universe not a page of politics, not a page of sociology (thank God) not a page of science. *They read the first chapter of the Book of Genesis*: "In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth . . ." And they took turns, the three of them each reading a verse until they reached the verse where it said "and when He looked upon that which He had made, God found it good".

Remember, by doing so they violated the Constitution of my country, the United States. The Constitution of the United States is more sacred than the Ten Commandments, because not even the most advanced catechist has suggested that we tear up the Constitution, but the Ten Commandments have been removed from any book you care to look at. There was a nutty woman in my country who decided to sue the astronauts for violating the First Amendment of the Constitution. They had read the Bible from a tax-supported, government-owned machine. Well, a friend of mine, a constitutional lawyer, saw a chance to get in on the act, and it was very attractive. He said, "I'll figure out a line of defence, and this is it: if you are finally called before the Supreme Court, I will

put you in the prisoner's box, and I will ask you your name. Then I will ask you your occupation, and you say 'Astronaut'. Then I will say: 'Where were you on the 24th of December?' and you'll say 'Several hundred miles above the moon, riding round it!' 'Did you or did you not read a book out loud into a microphone so that you were heard all through Creation from that machine?' 'I did'. 'What was the name of that book?' 'The Bible'. 'Who owned that machine?' 'The United States Government'. 'Who paid for it?' 'The tax payers'. 'Did you read that book to all the people in the nation — Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Orthodox, Zoroastrian, Hindu, Buddhist — without reference to their religion?' 'No'. 'Did you read it to the Catholics on a government-owned machine?' 'No'. 'Did you read it to the Communists to make enemies?' 'No'. 'To whom did you read it?' 'I read it to my three kids sitting in front of the telly' ”.

The Astronauts and the Synod

So you see in the most surprising circles this little instinct to get back to God and how things got started is very alive. When the Holy Father invited the astronauts to address the Synod of Cardinals, Achbishops and Bishops at the Synod of 1969, it was the best speech delivered during the Synod! It was certainly the most spiritual because during the question period one Cardinal put up his hand and said, "There is no doubt about it, your scientific accomplishment from a technological point of view was unbelievable. Did it have any effect on your spiritual life"? And one said, "I answer for all three because we have talked about this many times. The deeper we went out into God's creation and looked back at the earth and out at the planets, for the first time I began to understand the meaning of the phrase, 'Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, nor has it entered into the heart of man to conceive the wonders that God has prepared for those who love him' ". That was the effect that their technological adventure had on them as men who may

have grown a little weak in their faith — a little pre-occupied with the wonders of the new science. They had a lot on their minds that night, but, nevertheless, when they looked back, that's what came back to them. And you may be quite sure we read in the papers that the Russian Astronauts said, "Salute, Comrade Krushchev" from the moon, underneath their breath they probably said "Our Lady of Kazan, have mercy on our kids", as, equivalently, ours did.

Cartesian Philosophy and the Crisis

So the crisis in culture is, I think, beginning to end in a synthesis. Another thing contributed to this crisis; a philosophical factor. Many philosophers contributed to it, but if you picked out one it would be Descartes, a French student of the Jesuits, who thumped around in theology and psychology. Maritain once listed him among the great "thinkers" who had most contributed to modern philosophical attitudes. His theory was: there are some things which are the object of faith and some things which are the object of sheer scientific knowledge, and they're totally separate. Thus began this Cartesian philosophy that has dominated these last couple of centuries; the complete independence of faith and reason. The things that you know by faith tend to be purely personal — kind of between you and God. (As President Eisenhower once said at a press conference, when he was more mixed up than usual, "I want each of you to pray to the God of your own choice".) The things that are certain, like the things you learn in the science classes, are the fruit of rational experience. So there came this great division in the forms of knowledge, and the results of it have been far-reaching, especially in the nineteenth century when books were being written about "The Conflict between Religion and Science", a history of the conflict between religion and science.

In those days, there was great gab about Galileo — how poor Galileo, because he was smart, was put to death

by stupid guys who only had faith. Now the fact of the matter is that Galileo was also wrong. Galileo thought that the sun was the centre of the universe and that the earth went round the sun. On the latter point he was O.K., but, as a matter of fact, the sun is in a galaxy that is one of several million galaxies that Galileo never heard about. So his knowledge was incomplete, as the knowledge of those who judged him was incomplete — but those who judged him didn't happen to be the Pope. They were Dominicans and Jesuits who then, as now, were scrapping amongst themselves which had the right theology on passages of scripture — and, therefore, he fought it out with the bunch of them. The Jesuits were with him and the Dominicans were against him, and Galileo got life imprisonment. Well, really, not a bad one. I've seen the villa where he lived and I'll settle for it any day, right or wrong!

Modernism

Then there was a third thing. It had a heavy influence in this country and throughout the world, but mostly in Germany, France and what are now called the Benelux nations. It had a little influence in Italy, too. It was called Modernism. It was an inevitable follow-up on Descartes. It involved many and very lovely personalities. Have you noticed nowadays how when some people are criticised as theologians, you hear people say, "How can they possibly criticise such a sweet, gentle and good priest as if he were mistaken"? Well, you could have said that about half the Modernists — beginning with your own Father Tyrrell, who was gentle, sweet, friendly and *wrong* — and running down into Italy to a man like, say, Fogazzaro, who was sympathetic, poetic, literary, gentle, kind and *wrong* — because it is perfectly possible, just as you can be good-looking, gentle, kind and *stupid* or *cruel*. In any case, this thing called Modernism came along, and divided everything between the subjective and the objective. The things which are objective (which maybe are, maybe aren't)

and the things which my subjective, personal experience tells me are needed for my subjective, personal perfection. On the level of the class-room, teaching it is much more complicated than that because they too get everything gussied up with technical words of one sort and another.

The Experimental Sciences

Then, finally, there came the heavy emphasis on the so-called "experimental sciences". Whereas Descartes really undermined reason when he thought he was exalting it, the Modernists wiped it out. They reduced things to instinct, sentiment and feeling. And so this feeling and instinct led to a great dependence on the experimental sciences. "I really can't believe this unless I've experienced it". Make a list of the things you can't believe unless you've experienced them, but don't show the list to the policeman because he'll follow you home! The experimental sciences went into the ascendancy and with them techniques, like pedagogy, which is an experimental science, and methodology. Methodology began to become more important than the content. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where I was last Bishop, every teacher can be as ignorant as Paddy's pig on the subject that she's teaching — *but she must do a course in methodology*. The only thing absolutely required is that she has a certificate in methodology. If she knows French, that's helpful in the French class, but the main thing is to make sure she has methodology. This, particularly in my own country, has contributed mightily to the catechetical crisis. Everybody found fault, not with the content at first, because they hadn't read it for many years, but they found fault with the *methodology*. They said this had been done by rote. They get asked questions and, like Pavlov's dog, they give automatic answers. Now that's not good methodology. The answers happened to be correct, for the most part, but that's beside the point. The *methodology* was faulty.

Change to an Audio-Visual Civilization

Then, in the whole world of methodology and pedagogy

there took place a revolution which made approximately a fortune for a Professor at the University of Toronto up to that time. He discovered that we have undergone a great change. We have changed from a reading civilization into a visual and photographic civilization — so Fordham immediately hired him for \$100,000 a year to explain to the students that they like to look at pictures better than they like to read books. The students hadn't discovered that yet, you see, and therefore he gave lectures, having made "the most important discovery since the invention of movable type" (that was in a magazine underneath his picture); namely, that we live now in a visual or audio-visual civilization and you can't learn anything unless you see pictures of it and it's reduced to charts and flow-charts and so on. "The message is the medium".

And so we entered into the present marvellous phase; audio-visual education. Now there, too, someone is going to go home from this meeting sore and mad as blazes! They're going to say, "After all those charts I made and all those pictures I took, he stood up and made a plea for the old Baltimore catechism and the catechism published in England in 1885, when no one knew any religion and didn't know how to teach". Didn't know how to teach? Macaulay, Gladstone, Newman, Manning, Vaughan, Wiseman — those poor souls! I'd like a list of their opposite numbers fifteen years from now! Pedagogy or methodology, like theology, is an *aid* to catechetics; a tool, an instrument to a far greater end — the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ and the service of Jesus Christ in his brethren. That's the end, that's the purpose. The rest is an instrument towards that end, and has only the importance of an effective instrument, a useful tool. But for a while we were in danger of forgetting this, and hence the crisis.

The Coming of Methodology

We all began taking methodology courses. Priests would come into the Chancery and say, "I'd like to go to such

and such a university for a couple of months and study methodology". "Why Father?" "Well I want to learn how to teach the kids the catechism". "Well, I've been in your parish and they seem to me marvellously well instructed". "I know, but it's an old-fashioned way. That was *before* the Council". (I won't even go into what happened *after* the Council.) Then along came the change. The children shouldn't learn by being asked questions and by being brainwashed by sisters and priests who in turn have been brainwashed in Tridentine seminaries where they have been brainwashed by mediaeval theologians, who had been brainwashed by the Fathers of the Church, who had been brainwashed by Christ and the Apostles. No! Instead of this rote education, education should have in it a greater amount of dialogue. Dialogue is the new word for conversation. Do you remember when you used to have nice, pleasant conversations with your Protestant friends? Now I get *formal invitations* to dialogue with people I've been having conversations with for forty years, and I write back and say, "Do you mind if I don't come — it sounds kind of stuffy" — and I'm dying to have some *conversation!* But in those days we used to say as St. Paul said: "Conversatio nostra est in coelis" — "Our conversation is in Heaven". Where the dialogue is, witness deponeth not.

"Brainwashing"

The word "brainwashing" is the only word I know that has been translated into every single modern language. This has become the great indictment word against instruction. So instruction is to be replaced by *real* education — self-expression. My father used to say that you shouldn't be allowed to express yourself until you had something to express, but that was back in the Dark Ages when you were expected to make a contribution to the conversation. On the other hand, to be fair, these people have a lot to be said for their point of view. They're right: the root meaning of the word *education* is the latin word *educere*, and it means "to draw out of the depths" of someone

the things that in fact are *there*, and that you help him formulate and direct. So, there's a lot in this business about the part of dialogue, and self-expression, and all the rest of it in total education — but there's still a lot in listening to what is said by those who have been around a long time, and who've gone through it and have seen the good results and the bad.

Theology Confused with Faith

Finally and worse, and more or less contained in all that we have said, there grew up this tragic confusion between *faith* and *theology*. People go off to study theology so that they can teach the Faith, and they may come back prepared to *illumine* (as theology should do) the Faith or they may come back prepared to undermine it. It depends on who the professor was. Faith, I repeat, is a personal response to God revealing himself in Jesus Christ. The traditional object of faith we call Revelation, and only God can give us Revelation. Theology is exactly what the theologians want you to call it; it's a science. Sometimes they even want it to be thought of as an autonomous science, as if it weren't dependent upon what Christ had to say — and the Church. The Magisterium means those authorised to teach the Faith of the Church. That's what it means — with the Pope at the top of them and the authorization going down to the last catechist amongst the Bantu, as long as the catechist is in communion with that one at the top and teaching the same Faith. The theology can be true or false, partly true or partly false; good, bad, indifferent; temporary, long-standing. It can last for centuries like Gnosticism has. Gnosticism has been going now for eighteen centuries — London's full of it! Or it can be co-present with agnosticism, or even atheism in the theologians.

An Atheist Theologian

One of the best friends I ever had was a man who

was a graduate of my prep school and who spent the last years of his life in Rome with the Blue Nuns. He had been a Professor of Philosophy at Harvard and he's dead. He wouldn't mind my saying this before you because he's written it in books. He was a Master of Roman Catholic theology. I spent every Thursday afternoon for three years in his room at the hospital of the Blue Nuns for the sheer joy of hearing him talk about the Trinity, and the manner in which the Persons proceeded the one from the other and the *theology* of the Trinity. Sometimes when you'd go in he'd say, "What was the course this morning?" I'd say "We studied *De Verbo Incarnato*". "Oh, how I envy you. Who was the Professor? Did he tell you about the manner in which from all eternity the Logos was present in the mind of the Father" and so on, and he went all through that course as our own professors couldn't do. He *said* he was an atheist, and since I never knew him lie on anything else, I'll take his word for it. He did add, "I don't believe in any of this. I can explain it as I could explain the theology of the ancient Greeks and Romans, but I don't believe them and I don't find them very beautiful — as a matter of fact I find them rather vulgar. Whereas I find this the height of poetry, but I don't believe it. I have no faith, but I could not live in a country where the people did not love the Mother of Christ". Now, how do you explain that? You can't! It's a psychological crisis; its a cultural crisis; its Descartes, its Modernism; it's all the things we've been talking about — but it was honest, in his romantic case. I've listened on television to lads explaining to me why, though the greatest theologians since Athanasius, they are leaving the priesthood and marrying the choir girl. I am not so sure in their case — but I am in his. *He was a great theologian, very great* — but he was very short on *faith*, I happen to think he's in Heaven — that he was saved because he liked to be with people who love the Mother of Christ. In its way, it was a little incipient act of faith — and better than all the theology and all his books, all the volumes of them.

Spirit and Letter of the Council

Then there grew up the idea that there should be a pluralism of faith. There could be, can be, always has been from the days of the Gospel, a pluralism of *theology* — ways of explaining faith, clarifying it — but there's *only one Faith*. This little confusion about the word "pluralism" followed after the Council, particularly when people began to talk about doing and thinking things "in the spirit of the Council". Never mind the "letter" of the Council! Most of the people who talk to me about the "spirit of the Council" haven't read a paragraph of the documents of the Council. So there isn't much talk about the "letter" of the Council, but a lot of talk about the "spirit" and out of this has come this confusion of the purely subjective, pluralistic and personalistic, not to say *individualistic* nature of the Faith, which is one: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. So, in the first Synod called by Pope Paul, the first question put to the Synod fathers was, "What are we going to do about this confusion that Wright is going to be talking about in Southwark"? And there was a long discussion, faced with this confusion all over the world. Some said there should be established a rule of Faith, and either you conform to it or you don't. Well, it would be so long you could never stand it — with all the new ideas that would be piled on. Others said, "Why not, like Pius IX, have a Syllabus of Condemned Errors"? Well, the list of condemned errors would be as long as the Encyclopaedia Britannica! You wouldn't be able to find your error if you spent six months going through the thing! So, instead, it was decided to put into the hands of the Congregation of the Clergy under the then Prefect, Cardinal Villot, the responsibility for drawing up the General Catechetical Directory, which would be the norm and standard for Catechetical Directories in the different languages of the different countries and cultures.

The General Catechetical Directory

Already there's been a little feed-back that the standard

for each country will be the Catechetical Directory in *that* country. The answer is, No! It won't be! It says so right here in the release from Rome I hold in my hand. Each country has to shape the locally adapted and locally viable Directory in accord with the General Catechetical Directory and include the same Articles of Faith. The Methodology? Well, that depends on the culture of the country, The pedagogy? That depends on the type of people you're teaching: the age-group, the background, the vocabulary, the I.Q., a hundred things — but the *content* of the Faith is set forth in this little General Catechetical Directory. It's now been translated into sixteen different languages, and nothing I shall say tonight makes me more proud than that in all the English-speaking countries the same translation is used. The content is one and the same.

The question has come up many, many times (it came up at the Congress we had in Rome to present the General Catechetical Directory): How much of this is binding? (We don't like to be bound by much these days!) The answer is: Everything that was *always* binding is binding *now*. If it was *ever* part of the Faith, it is *still* part of the Faith. Some practices, some observances, we raise discussion about, because apparently some people are a little backward, some are a little forward, some this way, that way, and there's been much discussion about them. But the best explanation I've seen of what's binding and what's not binding was written by Father George Telford, who is located in the Diocese of Southwark and is a member of the Catechetical Commission. He says in effect that when people say (as three-quarters of you say every other day) "We don't know what we are supposed to teach and believe these days", the answer is: "You'll find it in the General Catechetical Directory". And then to the question, "What parts are binding"? he says: "The Foreword says those things which are said about Revelation (the things Christ taught and the Church transmitted) and the criteria according to which the Christian message is to be expounded, are to be held by *all*" even the Ph.D's (I put

that in — he's too kind to make a nasty crack like that). On the other hand, "those things which are said about the present situation, methodology, and the form of catechesis for people of different ages are given as *suggestions* and *guide-lines*". Now, that's not the long, domineering controlling hand of Rome — it's just the finger of the local traffic cop saying "Don't go down that street or you'll run into a fire or go off an open bridge". It's a healthy suggestion! So, there is a distinction between those things which are of the *Faith* and those things which are of the method and *presentation* of it, and the distinction is very well made. They're suggestions and guides, and they are indeed subject to evolution, development. Sure, we learn things by meditation, by studying, by research, by 101 ways, and those things are fair ground for development — but *not* the Articles of Faith.

A Congress in Rome

In order to discuss the General Catechetical Directory, and to get feed-back from the many nations and their delegates, we had the International Congress in Rome in October, 1971. Permit me here and now in the person of Archbishop Cowderoy to thank the English Hierarchy for the co-operation they gave us in the attendance at the Congress. There was still the funny little feeling that you find when people from different nations get together. For example, a sister, a Catholic sister, with a Spanish name, from California, wrote me a letter saying: "How representative from a democratic point of view was that Catechetical Congress? I got the impression there were a lot of Italians there". I wrote her and told her a secret: Rome is in Italy and lots of Italians live in Rome. Now there were actually a minority of Italians (200), and that was deliberately arranged so that the little sister would have a seat. You can't be more democratic than that! If I had the rearrangement, *she'd* be out, because she contributed nothing to the conversation, absolutely nothing. The results of the Catechetical Congress have been pub-

lished in this marvellous book, *Atti del 110 Congresso Catechistico Internazionale*. This copy in my hand is the seventh copy of it. We gave the first to the Pope, the second to Cardinal Villot, and the members of the Hierarchy are going to receive them.

A Catechism from Ghana

What were the purposes of this Congress? Considering that it was only held last October, the results are heart-warming. The nations of the world are now mailing into us the translations of the Directory and text books based on it — and prepare yourselves for a shock! I naturally thought that, since the Anglo-Saxons and Celts are the first and foremost of all the peoples in the world, the text-books which would come from our countries would be the best. Of the sixty-seven text-books that I have personally gone through, the best is from Ghana. How do you like that? Watch Africa! It's the Continent of the next century. It has nothing but the future. It has cultures, new enthusiasm. Their Archbishops in prison are in the same position that Becket was in the days of the Plantagenets. In other words, they're on the way up. The best book I found was the one from Ghana. Immediately on the first page it establishes a relationship between the child and God — and Faith and theology are primarily concerned with God, not with anthropology. Anthropology, psychology, zoology, and all the other sciences must, should, come in as helps — but this little book on the first page helps the child to establish his identity.

The tots are asked: "What is your Christian name? What does that name mean to you"? There's a lot of faith in the answer to that one! The whole Communion of Saints, your whole place in the Kingdom of God. Then, after a few other questions, "Do you have any brothers and sisters"? — and in Africa they do, by the way. So: "What are the names of your brothers and sisters"? Then there's a square place, a blank space, and it says, "*Put your thumb print here*". Now in my developed nation,

to put your thumb print on anything means you are in jail — the cops are making a record for the FBI when they take your thumb print! But this thumb print in Ghana is to make the point, "You are the only one in the world who has that thumb print; you are the individual, special object of God's love, when he helped form the body that carries that thumb print". Isn't that terrific? In an age of standardization, of technology, of computers, that a kid would look at his thumb and say, "I'm the only one who got that from God; that's a sign of the Image of God in me in the sense that God is unique. *There's only one*, and I'm the one that has that sign, that particular little mark". Isn't that beautiful? The whole book goes on in that vein. It moves on from that little point to others. "What will you do with that thumb"? And the first thing it tells the kid is the last thing you would normally think of — it says "I will make the sign of the Cross with it, because that is how God's son saved me" — and it goes on through salvation. "I will serve others with it". The Ghana kid also belongs to the horizontal Church, and he's prepared to put his thumb in the work with everybody else. He'll bear his witness, he'll get the social gospel — but he's learning the first law first. *Love the Lord God*, and Thy Neighbour as thyself. The Dogma, the Faith, *first*, and then the Moral Code, including social teaching.

A Time for Joy

Well, what was the purpose of our International Congress in Rome in October, 1971? To bring together people to learn their experiences; to stimulate them to bring the message to the ends of the earth in new terms — but the *same* message. To collaborate with Rome, compactly with Peter as did the Apostles when they started out to the ends of the earth. And to do so with a single Love, a single Hope and a single Charity, and I took the liberty then, as I take it now in concluding, to add one further thing. *I hope that every family will become*

a school of catechetics. The family is the first school of catechetics. No sister, no priest, no bishop, nobody taught me the place of prayer in my life as I learned it when I came in late and my father's bedroom door was ajar and the beam of light went into it and I saw the soles of his feet as he was kneeling by the bed saying his prayers before he went to bed at night. The family is the first school of spirituality and the first school of Faith. So the need for adult catechetics classes, in order that parents may be the teachers of their children, and the children may teach one another. We said that we will do it with Faith, with Hope and with Love — but I add a fourth quality: Joy! Has anyone else besides me discovered how Joy has disappeared from the face of the earth? It's disappeared from our music; "We shall overcome . . . we shall overcome . . ." Overcome *what*? Overcome *whom*? We used to be told: "Overcome *yourself* and then you'll be in a position to overcome others and you'll have a right and title to be heard". "Where are all the flowers gone . . . Long time passing . . ." Do you remember when you used to sing in May about the flowers? But you sang with joy! Do you remember the resounding music that used to practically shoot from the organ and fire the bride and groom down the aisle, ecstatic with joy? Joy in what? Joy in the *Faith*! I have known people to save their money all their lives, working in factories, to go back to the old country and see the parish church where they learnt the Faith and it was the greatest joy in their lives, because they were going *home* where the *family* was the first school of love, because of hope, because of faith, and therefore of service.

Protest and Joy

Every Wednesday I see thousands of people pour out of St. Peter's, their faces transformed with joy because they have looked on the face of the successor to him who looked on the face of Jesus Christ. There is needed this element of joy. Have you noticed, with all the contesters

and protesters, how dreary their faces are? Every week you buy your magazine and see a drip standing there bearing "witness" as it's called. If they'd just stand up and laugh in the Lord! But they say, "There's so much suffering in the world: If God is good, the suffering in the world would break his heart. It breaks mine, because I'm serious and I'm dedicated and I'm committed". Well, God sent His Son into the world and His Son's heart *did* break, and that heart is at the heart of the Universe, in the risen body of Jesus Christ. At the very core of things there's sympathy, but laughter, human as well as divine, thanks to the fact of the Resurrection and Ascension. St. Paul talked about *joy in the Cross* — and you're not going to find it anywhere else. But you'll only understand this if you have the Faith, and you'll only have the Faith if you follow what Papa Paolo and *faith* tell you.

The Price of one Man's Convictions

The father of Robert Browning was sent out to 'manage' one of the family's slave plantations in the West Indies. He soon discovered the nature of that 'management' and refused to serve. He was promptly disinherited. He retained into old age a vivid memory of the horrors of his experiences among the slave labourers in the West Indies. He preferred to serve for thirty years as a routine bank clerk (from Roy E. Gridley's *Browning*, Routledge, 1972).

Readings at Mass

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

FONTANA is bringing out the Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible in paperback form this month; we already, of course, have the inexpensive edition published by the Catholic Truth Society. This is the most "ecumenical" of modern English versions, accepted by the majority of Christians and one which I personally prefer. But since most of you probably hear the Jerusalem Bible read in church it seems more practicable to use it henceforward as our standard text in these monthly comments.

Did an actual dove appear at the Baptism of our Lord (Jan. 7)? "Like a dove", says our text (Mark 1, 10) — but such questions are really irrelevant, since what matters is the *meaning* of the vision. Who saw it, and heard the voice from heaven? In Mark it is apparently Jesus alone (which fits in with his reticence about his messiahship in the first half of this gospel); in Matthew others apparently hear the voice — "This is my Son" instead of "You are"; while the fourth gospel says that John the Baptist saw the vision (John 1,32). Fr. C. C. Martindale suggests ⁽¹⁾ that "men saw, and heard, what their souls were attuned to", citing John 12, 29-30 as an example; and he notes that at Lourdes and Fatima, St. Bernadette and the children "saw" our Lady but nobody else did.

The figure of a dove was used symbolically in the Old Testament in many ways, but which is here recalled? Martindale felt certain that it was the Spirit of God hovering over the waters (Genesis 1,2), "giving the first impulse to the history of the world"; McKenzie suggests that "the primary force of the symbol here is love, the love which the Father through his beloved Son communicates to all who believe in the Son". ⁽²⁾ This new creation

(1) *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 4.

(2) *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. Dove.

("he will baptise you with the Holy Spirit") has to wait for its fulfilment until Pentecost; but it begins here at the start of our Lord's ministry, which itself is carried out in the power of the Spirit. In the second reading (Acts 10,38) Luke does not suggest that Jesus *became* the Messiah or Anointed One (Christ) at the time of his baptism (cf Luke 1,35). It is a solemn investiture in his task; the actual baptism (of which he had no personal need) signifying his solidarity with sinful humanity on whose behalf he acts and suffers.

As to the words spoken by the "voice from heaven", they are taken from the first of the "Servant Songs" in Isaiah (first reading) with the substitution of Son for Servant (cf. Acts 3,13;4,27). The last of the four songs (Is. 52,13-53,12) is the basis for the expression *Lamb of God* used in next Sunday's gospel (the song is quoted in Acts 8,32). In Aramaic (the language spoken by our Lord) the word for *lamb* can also mean servant. But the idea of Jesus as the Paschal Lamb cannot be excluded (cf. I Cor 5,7; I Peter 1,19; Revelation 5,6-12). According to John's chronology the Paschal Lamb of the New Testament dies just when the paschal lambs of the Jews are being slaughtered in the Temple (3) and none of his bones are broken (Exodus 12,46; John 19,36).

It is only from John that we learn it was through the Baptist that Jesus won his first disciples (but see Acts 1,21-22). Mark's account on Jan. 21 in no way contradicts their previous meeting with Jesus. When the Baptist points out Jesus to them, they *follow* him — a word here used literally, but later in John's gospel (e.g. 8,12; 10,4) metaphorically. "What do you want?" asks Jesus ("seek" might be better). "Where do you live?" (RSV has "where are you staying?") on the face of it simply means that they want a conversation in private. "Come, and you shall see" sounds almost like a promise: "coming" to Jesus and "seeing" indicate faith throughout John's gospel. The time mentioned (four in the afternoon) suggests the importance

(3) Schnackenburg: *The Gospel according to St. John*, 1,299.

of the hour for the disciples, and the length and fruitfulness of the conversation, which went on all evening.

In the next incident, Andrew tells Peter "We have found the Messiah", and later in the chapter Nathanael calls Jesus "Son of God". No doubt Mark is more true to history in presenting our Lord's revelation of himself to his disciples as a gradual one (4,41; 8,29), but John telescopes this process in favour of his purpose in writing his gospel, summed up in 20,31.

"You are Simon, son of John", says Jesus, "you are to be called Cephas" — the Aramaic word for Rock with an added S in its Greek form: St. Paul several times uses this form of Peter's name in I Corinthians. John himself usually refers to him as Simon Peter. Here he gives the Jewish form in order to bring out its meaning (Rock) to his readers.

A few words about the second readings from I Corinthians. Libertines argued (as they do today) that sexual gratification is simply the satisfaction of a natural appetite, like eating and drinking. Paul appeals to the dignity and role of the Christian's body in the plan of salvation. We have here (Jan. 14) the earliest expression of his doctrine of the Body of Christ. Chapter 7 is written in answer to questions from the Christians of Corinth. Paul recommends a celibate life to those who can live it. But he must not be represented as despising marriage (see 7,38). Both states of life are "gifts from God" (7,7). He insists on the provisional nature of this world (Jan. 21), and his teaching is independent of any personal hope he had for the "coming of the Lord" in his own lifetime.

Rumours that others in addition to the Cardinals were to participate in future papal elections appeared laid last November.

Below, Father Crane gives his reasons for relief at this decision. He goes on to examine the present trend towards democracy within the Church and comes out firmly against it as hindering rather than helping the kind of wise counsel so needed at the present time.

CURRENT COMMENT

Democracy and the Church

THE EDITOR

IT was reported, last November, that the election of the Holy Father's successor was to be confined, after all, to those members of the College of Cardinals not debarred by age from taking part in it. This followed somewhat persistent rumours that the papal electorate was to be extended to include heads of episcopal conferences throughout the world; a decision that was said to have evoked bitter opposition from three of the curial Cardinals and murmurings from others.

The Choice of Pope

Whatever truth there may have been in these rumours and reports, I hope sincerely that the position will remain as stated last November and that the choice of future Popes will remain with the Cardinals. My reason for doing so is simple enough and may be worth stating here, not because it is mine, but because it is, I think, shared with

good reason by many today in the Church. It represents a point of view that is valid, yet inclined to be denied a hearing in progressive quarters on the somewhat ridiculous ground that it is anti-democratic — as if this, in all conscience, were the ultimate in contemporary sin. Those, however, who would keep the papal electorate as it is, are not interested in what they or their views are called. Their interest is the good of the Church and they see this good as promoted by wise counsel irrespective of whether it is popularly based or not. They are against that trend in the Church which identifies wise government with that which is representative and in this, I think, they are right. The two can coincide, but there is no reason why they should necessarily do so. History has shown us again and again that wisdom in high places is by no means the automatic fruit of the democratic process, even if we take Bellarmine's fine version of it as distinct from that — grounded in the fiction of a sovereign people — which Rousseau gave to the world.

The Need for Wisdom

In this matter, then, of the election of the Holy Father, what counts, under God, is that the choice should be wisely made. And once it is conceded that wisdom does not grow automatically with extended representation — that the more representative electors are, their choice, though perhaps more popular, is not necessarily more wise — there would appear to be no sufficient or good reason for making the election of a Pope more representative. The argument, of course, is negative, but perfectly sound. The onus of proof is on those who think otherwise. More positively, however, there would appear to be additional, very good reason for excluding the representative principle as a criterion for papal election. The main requirement, we have seen, is wisdom; the ability to take a detached yet overall view of the Church's needs and of the man best suited to meet them. Yet, it does not follow that heads of episcopal conferences may possess this quality in

sufficient measure to enable them to bring to a papal election the requisite wisdom of choice, which it so obviously requires. Good-will, indeed, will be theirs, but the very nature of their position and the circumstances which surround it may take from that detachment of view and that realization of the overall needs of the Church, which they must have if they are to choose wisely. Like it or not, they, like their fellow bishops everywhere, are trenched in on particular situations — tied to a multitude of local duties and cares, subject to many pressures — which deny them, for all their good-will, the detachment and breadth of vision so necessary to the business of choosing a Pope. Indeed, it is precisely that they may not become the prey of competing interests that bishops themselves continue to be appointed rather than elected, though soundings can and should be taken at all levels before the final choice is made. For there is no reason why, in the case of a bishop, the popular choice should necessarily prove the best choice. Indeed, in the opinion of a good many, there is every reason why the reverse should prove the case. The same would seem to apply, at several removes, to the election of a Pope. Extension of the franchise in this case to make it more representative because more popularly based carries no guarantee that the choice will be more wisely made; and it does give ground for belief that the choice will be less wise, because almost inevitably less detached, than before.

No Change Needed

The point, of course, can be made that many non-curial Cardinals are heads of episcopal conferences and subject, therefore, to the limitations set out above as reason for not extending the papal franchise beyond its present bounds. This is true; but, if the argument so far presented is sound, there is reason here for constricting rather than increasing the number of those who elect the Pope. I am not suggesting this. What we have at the moment is, if you like, a compromise, a constricted fran-

chise limited to Cardinals permanently in Rome or else in close touch with it. This arrangement has worked well through the ages because, as far as is humanly possible, it has given wisdom reasonable play. Here, once again, onus of proof would appear to rest on those who would extend the papal electorate to others, with a view to making it more broadly based. I see no positive merit in this system. I do detect in it a measure of likely harm. For this reason, I am against change in this matter; not because I am archaic in outlook, but because wisdom must be preserved at all costs in papal elections and I do not see in extended representation the means best suited to its increase or, indeed, preservation. It took the Church a long time to extricate the papacy from the clutch of princes. Why should it be thought that the clutch of the people at grass roots — through the representation of local bishops — will be any less strong?

Democracy and New Dynamism

At this point, I think, one can generalise somewhat and examine the present, attempted application of the representative or democratic principle to the life of the Church and, as opportunity offers in the context of this article, that of religious orders and congregations within it. The thought in general would seem to be that the structures of the Church and her religious orders of men and women should be democratised in order that they may be given a new dynamism and become, at one and the same time, more human within themselves and more involved with the world that lies about them. Called into question now by the democratizers are both authority and hierarchy in its general sense as inhibiting the kind of active, "meaningful" initiative thought necessary in the contemporary world. The solution is seen by many in terms of more representative government. The democratic apparatus is being fairly widely introduced as a means to this end.

An extended examination of this kind of thinking,

which is widespread at present, would take us over ground I have tried to cover already in these notes in previous months. Here, I would like to concentrate on the view which sees the democratization of Church structures as leading to new dynamism and greater involvement of the Faithful in the affairs of the world about them.

A Report on the University of Warwick

At the outset, I have to say that, so far, it seems to me to have had very largely the opposite effect to that originally intended. So far as dynamism is concerned, more people, indeed, are busy within the new democratic structures, but less work appears to be being done. One reason, I feel sure, is that the attempted democratization of Church structures has resulted in the imposition of a new bureaucracy at most levels of its life. Democracy, in other words, has tended to become bureaucracy. Parkinson's Law is at work now within the Church and its Orders as never before. In this connection, a Report produced three years ago at the request of the University of Warwick by John Tyzack and Partners, a firm of industrial consultants, would seem to have its relevance. Here are some of its observations. They might have been written, in my opinion, of the contemporary Church: "We have been told that democracy has a special place in university life, and that there is constant political pressure from the rank and file of the academic staff claiming the right not only to be consulted but to 'have a hand in decision-making'. The result in practice is already an amorphous and time-wasting system which has led to needlessly protracted argument, dilatoriness in the taking of decisions, uncertainty regarding the effective centres of power and action, and at times to conflicts of policy". And then comes a sentence written with what the *Sunday Times* called killing simplicity: "Sooner or later the University of Warwick will have to come to terms with the age-old conflict between democratic principles and effective government". I would say that the

same applies to the post-conciliar Church at most of its levels. Never, I think, has there been a time when there has been so much talk within it and so little effective action. This must be so whilst government remains ineffective and government has become ineffective because it has placed round itself and at most levels within the Church, a democratic apparatus, which has fast become bureaucratised, thereby blocking effective action for the reasons already given in the passage cited above from the Report on the University of Warwick. Cardinal Heenan may have been thinking the same when he called at Birmingham last September for fewer conferences and more pastoral work within the Catholic Church. "I sincerely believe", he said, "that in addition to sapping physical energy the present burden of talk induces a weariness of the spirit leading to narcissicism and neglect of personal prayer". He went on to add that many who had left the priesthood or the religious life would still be with the Church if they had not dissipated their zeal in endless talking (*Times* 15/9/72).

Short Memories

This, indeed, is a great part of it, and there is the additional fact, noted in the Tyzack Report, that "uncertainty regarding the effective centres of power and action" cripples initiative and inhibits effective action. One wonders, for example at the level of aid to the developing countries, how Cor Unum ties in with the Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace and how both relate, in practice, to Caritas, Misereor, Auxilium and our own CAFOD, which does such excellent work, to name but a few of the many aid organizations within the Church. Parallel examples can be found very easily in other fields of activity and, at the lower levels of diocese, deanery and parish. It would not, I think, be cynical to say that, at all of them, the tendency has been for democracy to fall victim to bureaucracy. The committee, that deadly enemy of dynamism, has come into

its own in the contemporary Church in the name of involvement: very often — in most cases I would say — its net effect has been to prevent just that: active Catholicism is further removed from the real problems of the world than ever it was before. The medium, indeed, has become the message. One startling effect of the new radicalism within the Church has been its singular inability to get to the roots of any real problem within contemporary society. The democratic apparatus it has set round itself has confined its activity largely to the periphery of events. Memories are all too short. Much the same thing happened nearly thirty years ago in this country when the attempt was made to put Catholic Action, as it was then called, on a bureaucratised, diocesan basis. A flop from the start, the experiment was mercifully short-lived. It mushroomed committees; then died. My guess is that the same will happen with the present attempt to democratise the Church as an aid to dynamic action.

Democracy and Wise Counsel

And the end will come eventually not only because of the committees which turn democracy into bureaucracy and block communication between head and members, whether the head be bishop or parish priest or a national conferences of bishops. The real point, it seems to me, is that the democratic apparatus is the wrong instrument for the task that confronts the Church at the present time. If the task be defined as that of making the Church a more effective instrument of God's word in the contemporary world, then the thing needed surely, as a means to this end, is wise counsel through consultation; that those in authority in the Church and her Orders may be better informed of the needs of men so that the spiritual and material resources they command may be used to greater advantage and with more effectiveness in God's service. What is needed above all else is wise advice given to authority at all levels within the Church, along with

a technique of communication that gives effect to its wishes and commands. What has to be questioned, therefore, is not the need of authority in the contemporary Church for wise counsel, but the somewhat extraordinary view that sees the democratization of Church structures as the best means of bringing this about, thinking that the decisions of authority at all levels will be most wisely framed and effectively made to the extent that the democratic process allows the Church's rank-and-file to share in them to the greatest possible extent. This is the new ecclesiastical populism of which, in the field of secular politics, Anthony Wedgwood Benn has been so vociferous an exponent in past months. The plea is for participatory democracy. What its exponents seldom realise is that, once introduced, it turns all too soon into computerised democracy; which means that the personal touch goes from the entire process, which turns at this point into a mechanised bureaucracy, as remote from the original participants as the staff of an employment exchange from those who are out of work.

The Relegation of Wisdom

One has only to examine further the assumptions underlying the present trend towards democracy within the Church to see how wrong-headed it is — with its apparent and naive belief that all in the Church are equal in this sense, that each is sufficiently *au fait* with its problems to pronounce wisely on them and, secondly, that wisdom is to be found in a majority of their votes. What happens, of course, under such circumstances, is that wisdom and experience are set at a discount because placed on a par with ignorance. Authority, in consequence, is deprived of the real advice that it needs because those fit to give it are relegated by the new democratic process to the periphery of the Church's affairs. Far from promoting wise decision-making the numbers game, as played today by democrats within the Church, tends only to inhibit it. I believe this accounts very largely for the paralysis of authority in the Church and in religious orders in face

of the many and pressing problems that confront them. Either this or, by way of escape, a frightening concentration on trivial matters, which are devoid of significant content and remote from the real problems of mankind.

Democratizers within the Church have denied authority wisdom at the time it is needed most. This is the main burden of my charge against them. And they have done so because, naively, they have identified mass democracy as a vehicle of wise counsel when, in fact, the reverse is the case. Because what the democratic process in fact does, as we have already seen, is to set wisdom at a discount because allotting it a voting strength no greater than ignorance and affecting to find wise choice not in the quality of advice given, but in the quantity of votes cast in favour of a certain move. At this point, I am reminded of a remark in Cecil King's famous — or infamous — *Diary*; that Mr. Wilson's introduction of voting at Cabinet Meetings was bad precisely because it set brains and experience at a discount. This is what is happening in the Church and her Religious Orders today. The democrats are in charge.

Laity not in Favour

The interesting thing about the whole of this experiment is that the laity, on the whole, do not want it. Naturally enough, they are happy to be consulted from time to time by parish priest or bishop; many are only too willing to assist, for example, with Church finance. What they are against, however, is the build-up of a clericalised lay bureaucracy within the Church in the name of a fake involvement. Reasons are clear and obvious enough. Most of them are without the time for the amount of committee and paper work involved in such a proceeding and many — realizing its futility — are without the inclination. Able Catholic laymen, precisely because they are able, are extremely hard-worked outside Church circles and should not be expected to devote precious hours of their well-earned week-ends working inside them;

all the more so when such work takes committee form and adds up very often to a great deal of talk over very little. Once again, they would give generously of their time if called by priest or bishop or a high-powered lay group within the Church to a mind-stretching job on a consultative basis; but fiddling with the fringe of parish affairs is a very different thing, right and properly out so far as they are concerned. I do not blame them one bit. The result, however, is most unfortunate and merely adds to the mess already illustrated above. For the absence of men of real ability — their exclusion from Church policy at all levels as a result of democratization — places the lay possessors of little minds in charge of the new democratic framework at the level of parish and dioceses. Naturally enough, because they have little minds, these press on with the demands and resolutions which are tied up for the most part with the outer minutiae of Church affairs and as far removed from the reality of the Church's mission as chalk from cheese. This is almost inevitable under a system which brings to the fore in the Church's affairs those who have time to fiddle around inside the Church because they are so often without the ability that gives them a time-consuming job outside. They have smallish minds and plenty of spare time; and both are given most generously to parish and diocese. In the past this was fine because the jobs these good people did were left, through the absence of the democratic process, at the level of their capacity. The thing goes wrong under the Church's new democratic set-up when they are moved into positions of power and expected to help shape policy and give wise advice to those in authority. Of this they are, for the most part, incapable. As a result, policy is almost non-existent and authority becomes palsied; finding escape, as already noted, in concentration on minutiae. All are busy; no real work is done, and this at a time when, under God, wise counsel in aid of intelligent work is more necessary in the Church than, perhaps, ever before in her history.

The Ineffectiveness of Social Action

We have, I think, in the analysis given above, a fair explanation of the naivete surrounding a great deal that has passed and continues to pass for effective social action since the Second Vatican Council. Democracy, with its involvement in decision-making of men of mediocre mind, has meant, in fact and necessarily, that a great deal of Catholic activity has been set at mediocre level. There is, for example, a naivete about the approach of Catholics to contemporary social problems that would make pre-conciliar social actionists turn in their graves. These really *worked* at the social problem. Their little-minded contemporaries of today merely skirt round it. But even that, I am afraid, is too favourable. Today's social actionists are incapable even of skirting round the social problem because they have not yet recognised what it is and, as things stand at present, I think they will remain incapable of doing so for a very long time to come. The attempted democratization of the post-conciliar Church must, I think, be held largely responsible for this state of affairs, if only for the fact that its main effect, perhaps, has been to bring to the centre of the Church's affairs, the owners of little minds who, in former days, where better and more happily occupied at the periphery. Moreover, I believe the installation of the democratic process to be largely responsible for the fact that the Church's energy, since the Council, has been so inward turning, so in on itself. It is not merely that little minds take refuge in lots of paper; but, also and more simply, that little minds turn in on internal structures because they are without the background, capacity or moral courage to face the problems of the outside world. Look, for example, at the Dutch. They had some magnificent Catholic Movements before the Church in Holland fell into modernist hands. Now that democracy has come to the Church in Holland, the energy has gone from Dutch Catholicism — used up in its piffling mini-Council — and vision has deserted it; and the vision has gone and,

with it, the energy because, in Holland, democracy has placed little-minded men in charge of Church affairs. It could be the same here in England. Few lay figures stand out in the Catholic Church in England today. The reason, I think, is both brutal and clear. They do not stand out in the Church because, with a few notable exceptions, they stand out elsewhere. The laymen who command the apparatus of democracy in the Church will not have them; or, if you like and much better, they will not be had. There is no room for their advice — and, my goodness, how good it could be — in a Church where the attempt at democracy has brought mediocrity to the fore.

Small wonder that the Church not merely appears, but in my opinion, is, in fact, far less effective than it was before the Council, without the ability of former days to touch with effect and at all stages of social life the points of influence and power. There are, of course, other reasons additional to that given here. All I have sought to indicate in these notes is that, from the angle of effective action, the insertion of the democratic process into Church structures has proved the kiss of death so far as dynamism within it is concerned. Its addiction for quantity has meant the relative exclusion from Church councils of quality and, with it, a wealth of wise counsel denied those in authority at the very time it is needed most.

The Tax Credit System

J. M. JACKSON

IN October the Government published a green paper outlining a tax credit scheme to replace the existing system of income tax allowances and to modify the existing system of social security. The scheme must be judged from two viewpoints. First, it is intended to simplify the income tax system and to cut out much of the work that is required in administering the PAYE system. Secondly, it aims at modifying the burden of personal taxation on different households and in some instances to provide automatically benefits which hitherto have been available only subject to a means test.

Simplification

The basic idea is, that for employees, income tax will be placed on a weekly or monthly basis. A taxpayer will be given certain credits. The rates proposed are £4 for a single person, £6 for a married couple and £2 for each child. Tax will be at the rate of 30 per cent of all income. This means that if a married man without children has an income of £40 in any week, his tax liability will be 30 per cent of that wage less whatever tax credit he is entitled to. That is, the deduction to be made from his wage for tax by the employer will be £12 less the £6 credit for a married man. Thus the deduction will be £6. To take another example, if a man with two children has a wage of £50, his tax liability will be £15 (30 per cent of £50) less the appropriate credit, £10, so he will in the end have £5 deducted.

It will not be immediately apparent to most people how this represents a simplification of the present system, which gives a taxpayer certain tax-free allowances which are deducted from his earnings and the remaining taxable

income is then charged the appropriate rate of tax. The answer to this question is that simplification could have been achieved by retaining the allowance system and without resorting to credits. The simplification results not from the change of system but from the adoption of a weekly rather than annual basis for the taxation of employees. At present, under PAYE, a deduction is made each week, but the calculation of the deduction is far from simple. The taxpayer is given a code number which represents the allowances he is entitled to. The employer looks up this code number in a set of tables and discovers the tax allowances the worker is entitled to at that date. If it is the twenty-sixth week of the tax year, this will be one half of his total allowances for the year. This free pay is then deducted from his total income for the year to date and the employer then looks up his tax liability on taxable income to date and deducts from the current week's pay the difference between this total liability and the amount of tax already deducted. This clearly involves a great deal of work for the employer. But there is also a great deal of work in the system for the Inland Revenue authorities.

Recording will be necessary whenever a man's circumstances change. Employers will have to be notified of all recordings as well as the workers themselves. If a man changes his job, because of the cumulative nature of PAYE it is necessary to inform new employers of the worker's earnings and tax to date. And then in some situations there are tax refunds due to workers in some weeks when they may not be earning. All of this work will be unnecessary when a weekly basis for taxation is submitted for the annual.

Credit or Allowance?

The case for a credit rather than an allowance system does not depend therefore on the desirability of simplification and the reduction of the work of administering the scheme. The Credit system is needed in so far as any attempt is made to combine the income tax and social

security systems. Consider the case of a low paid worker with an income of, say, £20 a week, married with three children. He would be assessed under the proposed scheme for tax of 30 per cent which on his income of £20 would be £6. His tax credits would be £12. Under the tax allowance system, if his allowances were greater than his total income, he would simply pay no tax; that would be the end of the matter. If, however, his tax credits are greater than his tax liability, the difference between the two will be paid to him. So the employer, instead of making a deduction from this man's wage for tax would add another £6 on to it. (He would, of course, deduct such payments from the net liability he might have in respect of all his workers; in the event of an employer with a predominantly low paid labour force paying out to some workers more than he deducted from others, he would ultimately recover the net cost of paying these credits from the authorities.)

The tax credit scheme would, in large measure, replace the present Family Income Supplement. The operation of the scheme in respect of a married man with one child may be compared with the effects of Family Income Supplement. The latter has a 'prescribed income' of £20 for such a family. If the family's income is less than this, half the difference is made up. So a man earning £18 a week could get Family Income Supplement of £1. Under the tax credit system, he is assessed for £5.40 tax and has tax credits of £8. This means that he will receive £2.60 and is £1.60 better off under the tax credit system. If he had earned £20, he would not have been entitled to Family Income Supplement, but under the tax credit system his tax assessment would be £6 and he would still be entitled to a £2 benefit.

Apart from providing more generous benefits for those in need than the present Family Income Supplement, the scheme avoids the need for any means test or special application. The worker merely gives the employer his tax credit card, like any other worker, and the benefit is automatically added to his wage packet. The operation

of the system may also benefit certain other groups who would be entitled to Supplementary Benefits but prefer not to make a claim. It will, for example, assist many people who are drawing National Insurance benefits, including pensioners. The new level of National Insurance retirement pension for a single person is £6.75 a week. Tax on this would amount to roughly £2.02 whereas a single person would have a tax credit of £4. Such a person automatically receives an additional benefit of £1.98 without applying for Supplementary Benefit, and this would be paid along with the ordinary pension. The same would apply to recipients of Unemployment or Sickness Benefit.*

Supplementary Benefit

The Tax Credit System will not do away entirely with means-tested Supplementary Benefit. For one thing, the credits will only be given to people in employment and earning more than £8 a week or drawing National Insurance benefits or adequate occupational pensions. This will mean that some people may still have to apply for Supplementary Benefit or, perhaps, Family Income Supplement. The benefits provided through the tax credit system may not be sufficient in all cases to bring a person up to the Supplementary Benefit scale after paying rent, particularly if rent is above average. The present scheme must therefore be retained as a final safety net, subject to means testing. To set up a tax credit system with universal coverage and a scale of credits such that nobody would need apply for any means test benefit would involve a cost that would be totally prohibitive. Similarly some people in low paid employment might fall outside the new scheme and need to apply for Family Income Supplement. A young unmarried mother for example might earn only £7.50 for

* In the case of Unemployment and Sickness Benefit, these have hitherto been tax free even though the income a person received over the whole year may have been considerable and he paid a substantial sum in tax. If the tax credit is allowed to people drawing Sickness and Unemployment Benefit, there is clearly no need to provide a further benefit by continuing this tax exemption.

working 30 hours. She would not qualify for tax credits, but would get £6.25 under FIS.

The Size of Credits

The Government has already announced its intention of introducing a 'unified income tax' in the financial year 1973/74. This will tax all income, both earned and unearned, at the rate of 30 per cent instead of the present rate of 38.75 per cent with two-ninths of earned income tax free. (This means that in effect the rate of tax on earned income has been roughly 30 per cent.*) Under the unified tax system to be introduced in April 1973, the personal allowance for a single person will be raised to £595 and for a married couple to £775. For a single person, this allowance means a reduction in his tax liability of £176 or £3.43 a week; for a married couple, the reduction in tax as a result of the personal allowance is about £5.80 a week. The proposals for the tax credit system are based on credits of £4 for a single person and £6 for a married couple. The credit system therefore involves a lowering of tax liability for all taxpayers.

The proposed credit of £2 for each child is intended to take the place not only of the present income tax child allowance but also the Family Allowance payable in respect of the second and subsequent children. Let us see how the £2 credit compares with the present benefits. For the person with an income that makes him liable to pay income tax, the income tax child allowance of £155 is worth about £1.12 a week. In addition, the taxpayer will receive Family Allowances of 90p a week for the second and £1 for subsequent children. For these children, however, the income tax child allowance is reduced so that all the increase of 50p in the Family Allowance given some years

* In addition to the normal 30 per cent rate of tax (and higher rates on incomes over £5,000) there will be a 15 per cent surcharge on investment income over £2,000. If these proposals are, in fact, implemented, it means that the tax on investment incomes below £2,000 will be lowered from 38.75 per cent to 30 per cent but raised from 38.75 per cent to 45 per cent on incomes over £2,000.

ago is recovered in tax. Even the original 50p allowance for the third and subsequent children was subject to income tax, so that the net value of the £1 Family Allowance was in fact only 37p. The combined value of the income tax child allowance and Family Allowance is therefore £1.39. This figure is based on the minimum tax child allowance. The highest rate for older children would be equivalent to a further reduction in tax liability of 37p. This means a total benefit of £1.76 for the older child. The proposed tax credit is again set above this value of present benefits, so that it will be an improvement in the tax position of all taxpayers with children. It will, of course, be particularly significant for one child family, for such families will now receive exactly the same benefits in respect of the one child as are paid in respect of subsequent children, and this uniform benefit is more valuable than present benefits. At the lower end of the income scale, the benefits will be even more significant. Such families, if below the point at which they pay income tax, receive only the Family Allowance, at the most £1 and of course nothing for the first child. Under the new scheme, they will receive £2 in respect of each child. Of course, the net gains will not be nearly as great as this where the family has been entitled to and actually receiving Family Income Supplement. Nevertheless, as we have already seen, the new scheme will normally be more generous than Family Income Supplement.

The Cost of the Scheme

There is, of course, one big question that everyone is bound to ask. If everyone is to pay less tax, where is the government to find the money. The Green Paper itself suggests that the cost will be of the order of £1,300 million.*

* The estimates are all based on current data. That is, they present a picture of the scheme as it would be if in operation at the present time. It is suggested that it will be five years before it can be introduced and by then the cost will be greater, all the credits will have to be increased, and the basic rate of tax may be higher or lower than it is at the present time.

The cost of the introduction of the scheme represents roughly one-fifth of the total yield of the income tax at the present time. The government has claimed that the scheme would make considerable administrative savings. Something like 15,000 fewer people may need to be employed by the Inland Revenue. But even if we assume that these receive an annual salary of £2,000 the total saving is only £30 million. This is nothing compared with the reduced yield of £1,300 million. We must consider, therefore, the various ways in which the government could deal with the loss of £1,300 million. There are three possibilities, and various combinations of the three. First, it is possible that the scheme could be introduced at a time when substantial tax cuts were the appropriate measure in the light of economic circumstances. It is, however, just as likely that the reverse would be the case. One cannot assume that conditions when the scheme is introduced will call for tax cuts. This leaves two other possibilities. One is that the rate of tax will be higher than the present 30 per cent. If the level of credits reduces the yield of the tax by 20 per cent, the rate of tax would not need to be raised by anything like 25 per cent, from 30 per cent to 37.5 per cent (that is to give a 25 per cent increase over the level to which the yield would otherwise be reduced). The third possibility is that in order to meet the net cost of the tax credit system indirect taxation would have to be increased.

It would not be easy to assess the impact of increased indirect taxation on different income groups and household sizes without a very detailed study of consumption patterns and knowledge of the prevailing system of taxation. (By the time the tax credit system can be implemented, the major indirect tax will be VAT). It is possible, however, to see what the impact of raising direct taxation by a given amount would be. We can quite easily see what difference it would make to different families if the rate of income tax were to be fixed at $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent instead of 30 per cent. (A very hasty calculation suggests

that this is about the magnitude of increase in the rate that would in fact be required to restore the yield of the income tax to its present level.) Let us compare the impact of this higher rate of tax on single persons, childless couples, and on two and four child families where the man is earning £20, £30 and £40 a week. The table below shows the income after tax under the slightly simplified system proposed for 1973/4 and under the tax credit system with the rate of tax at both 30 and 33½ per cent.

Income after tax of selected households.

Income (weekly)		Single Man	Childless Couple	Couple with	
				two children	four children
£20	a)	£17.45	£18.50	£20.90	£22.90
	b)	£18.00	£20.00	£24.00	£28.00
	c)	£17.35	£19.35	£23.35	£27.35
£30	a)	£24.40	£25.50	£29.50	£32.35
	b)	£25.00	£27.00	£31.00	£35.00
	c)	£24.00	£26.00	£30.00	£34.00
£40	a)	£31.40	£32.50	£35.10	£38.10
	b)	£32.00	£34.00	£38.00	£42.00
	c)	£30.70	£32.70	£36.70	£40.70

a) tax as proposed for 1973/4

b) 30 per cent tax with tax credits operating

c) 33½ per cent tax with tax credits operating

If we look at the position of the single man, we see that at the £20 a week level there is little difference between any of the three possibilities. The introduction of the tax credit system with the 30 per cent rate mentioned in the Green Paper would give the single man an extra 55p a week. With the tax credit system and the 33½ per cent rate, he would be 10p a week worse off than under the present system. At the £30 a week level the

single man would gain about 60p a week under the tax credit system with the lower rate but lose 40p a week under the system at the higher rate. With £40 a week, the single man gains 60p from the introduction of the credit system at the lower rate and loses 70p at the higher rate. It will be seen from the table that the childless couple who would gain appreciably at all income levels from the introduction of the credit system at the lower rate of tax still gain a worthwhile amount from the system at the higher tax rate where the husband is earning £20 a week but the gain falls with income, being only 20p at £40 a week. (And at still higher income levels the childless couple would be worse off with credits and the higher tax rate than under the present arrangement.) At all three levels considered, families with children remain significantly better off under the credit system, even with the higher rate of tax, though the gains are considerably curtailed at the higher income levels. In other words, some (indeed most) single persons would pay slightly more than under the present system if tax credits were introduced at the $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent rate, whereas most families with children would gain, even though the gains would be much less than with the 30 per cent tax rate. There would, therefore, be an element of redistribution in a tax credit scheme with this higher tax rate compared with the present set up, a redistribution from most single taxpayers in favour of those with children, whilst most married couples without children would be in much the same position as now.

Who Gets the Credit?

One question which is causing some debate is who is to receive the tax credit in the case of families with children. At present Family Allowances are paid across the Post Office counter, usually to the mother. It would be quite easy for the tax credits to be used entirely as an offset to tax payable by the father, and if any net benefit were payable to the family, if the tax fell short of the credits due to the family, this difference could be added

to the man's pay packet. There would be considerable administrative savings if credits were dealt with in this way and the work of paying out Family Allowances eliminated. The total income of the family would not be affected by the method of paying out any benefit. The objection being raised by some people is that in many cases if nothing replaces the direct payment of Family Allowances to the mother, she will not in fact be given the extra money that goes into her husband's pay packet. Should the tax credits for husband and wife and perhaps the first child be dealt with by the father's employer but that the credit for the second and subsequent children be paid in cash to the mother. Thus in the case of a couple with two children and the father earning £25 a week, the position would be as follows (assuming a 30 per cent tax rate); the credits due to the family are £6 for a married couple and £2 for each child. The father would be allowed credits of £8 against his tax liability. As this would be only £7.50, his wage would be supplemented by the 50p difference but his wife would draw a further £2 in respect of the second child from the Post Office. The question that must be asked, and no answer can be given here, is whether the costs of paying some credits over the post office counter should be incurred because the family income in some instances is not used to best advantage.

A study group of pedagogical experts recently gave it as their judgment that religion should be taught as an opinion not as a fact. How can one counter such a view? Surely it is our task to show Protestants that Christ's truth can be found *only* in the Holy Roman Catholic Church? What is the truth in the charge that faith and trust in Providence prevent people from growing up to adult self-reliance?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

A recent B.B.C. news item gave the judgment of a study group of pedagogical experts that religion should be taught not as a fact but as opinion, from which pupils are free to dissent. How can one counter such a view?

It is easy enough to be indignant and to say scathingly that the only reality which must not be presented as factual is the Supreme Reality of God. But the experts could point out to you that the children in a Catholic school would be hearing that God is real, while the children in a school next door might be learning that God is a father-figure invented for the comfort of the young and the lonely. A pedagogical difficulty certainly arises from the variety of opinions about God, which is totally different from the unanimity about most of the other subjects in the curriculum. We hold that the existence of God is knowable and demonstrable by reason alone; but there are lecturers in Departments and Colleges of Education who contradict the assertion, and on grounds of reason. Religion being a serious practice along the centuries and across the earth, it should

be taken account of in schools (though some humanists conduct a bitter campaign to ban it); but it is a divisive rather than a unifying subject, and, on their premises, it is reasonable for the experts to make the judgement you quote.

The counter is to preserve our Catholic schools and in them to introduce children not just to accept assertions of fact but to live a faith. The virtue of faith which they received in baptism needs to be exercised, and all effective means should be used to bring them to real, personal assent to the truths of faith and to affirm in behaviour their personal dedication to God.

In a recent "Answer" you wrote that "the task of ecumenism for Catholics is to find Christ's truth in non-Catholic Churches." Surely our task is to show Protestants that Christ's truth can be found *only* in the Holy Roman Catholic Church.

Yes. The full truth is in the Roman Catholic Church and nowhere else. But that doesn't mean that every other Christian Church and every other religion is wholly and entirely false. They are true in that they acknowledge a duty of worshipping God. The non-Catholic Christians have an allegiance to Christ; and they have, from baptism, the gift of supernatural life. What specifies each of the Protestant Churches is an absence of one or other of the essential Christian doctrines, all of which are preserved in the Catholic Church. They lack the Sacrament of Order, or the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence, or some of the other Sacraments, or true esteem for Our Blessed Lady, and so on. Protestantism as such is negative. But every heretical renegade took with him, into schism, some part of the Church's truth, which his followers, who are not renegades, have preserved more or less. Those who are sincere hold sincerely to their errors but also to their truth. If we can discover that truth, then we have a common ground on which to stand with them

as a preliminary to advancing together towards the full truth which we can show them. There is no compromise in that programme; but it does take account of the facts and is one of the better ways of teaching.

What truth is there in the charge (made by André Gide, amongst others) that faith, and trust in Providence, prevent people from growing up to adult self-reliance?

In theory, no truth at all. There may be a few, feckless or notably stupid, who expect God to help those who do not help themselves. If they are as childish as that, they must spend their lives "incare" or cadging. The average Christian assumes responsibility for self and for others, and is at least as mature as most.

It is instructive that those in the condition of unbelief that Gide recommends are at their wits' end trying to find a substitute for the faith and the providence they have discarded. God does not disappear because they deny His existence: and they do not remove the essential dependence of their nature just by claiming to be captain of their soul and master of their fate. Instead of trust in God they have a gnawing fear of their own inadequacy. They work desperately hard to make their job safe and their future secure. They become obsessed with safety and security, because there is no power which can save them from unexpected disturbance of the smooth progress they plan. They have safety measures: safety matches, safety pins, safety razors, safety belts. They arrange to have social security; and they buy insurances of all kinds, perhaps even insurance against the failure of their insurance company. For all their precautions, they are no more invulnerable than Christians; and in their preoccupation with the future they have lost the ability to enjoy the present. They are so busy playing Providence that they have no time to be themselves.

I had rather be a Christian, doing what I can and confidently leaving the rest to God.

Isn't punctuality a virtue? Then why is it neglected by people of Catholic culture: Italian, Irish, Spanish? Why can't they be in time?

"Manana". "Tomorrow is also a day". I know what you mean. Punctuality can be a duty, and the performance of duty can be virtuous. But what "time" are you talking about? Cosmic time, seasonal time, the time of the human organism — or clock time? Clock time, for sure. But that time is only an artificial measurement of change and succession which can be measured in many other ways. To suppose that clocks and watches have authority over us is to enslave ourselves to a mere computer. A large part of our liberty has already been surrendered by previous generations. For the sake of order in society people began to live by the clock, so that fixed moments could be set for the beginning of work, meals, sleep, divine service and any other social activity of importance. The animal part of us, which should eat when it is hungry, sleep when it is tired, work when it wants to, and get up when it feels like it, has had to abandon its natural rhythms and run like clockwork. That was a reasonable price to pay for the blessings of an ordered family and community life. It is reasonable, then, to turn up on the dot when our presence is expected by others. But those fortunate enough to have escaped the tyranny of the clock are to be envied and by no means despised. They have leisure in which to enjoy life, command over time which they make their servant, a healthiness of mind and manners which the rest of us are losing. We should relearn how to breathe easily and to saunter.

Is it right for a woman under instruction as a prospective convert to receive communion in her own Church?

Doesn't it depend on the extent of her commitment to the Catholic Church? Instruction is accepted for a variety of reasons. Mere enquirers into the insistent claims which

the Church makes to the whole truth can be firmly attached to their own community, and to be in communion with it by reception of "the Sacrament" betokens no doubleness of purpose. "A prospective convert", as you call her, can have a near or a distant prospect of conversion; and distance means uncertainty of the Church's doctrine — lack of faith, in other words. Communion in a non-Catholic Church could, in that case, be a prayer for faith, and it could be laudable.

Someone under instruction who already believes in the one true Church and all her doctrines, including the doctrines of transubstantiation and the Real Presence would be denying her faith by communicating in a Church she knows to be false. It is hard to see how that action could be justified. Is she wanting to keep up as long as possible with her old religious associates? That would be a reprehensible "human respect". Is she convinced that the minister in her place of worship has valid orders and intends, at the communion service, to consecrate? Then by receiving Communion from him she would be actively condoning schism and the various heresies that are implied in schism or consequent upon it.

Your question suggests that the woman you have in mind will be received into the Church as soon as her statutory instructions are completed. She should, if that is so, be going not to the non-Catholic service but to Mass.

Book Review

Education: The Need for Authorative Teaching

Education: Threatened Standards edited by Dr. Rhodes Boyson; Churchill Press Ltd., 2 Cecil Court, London Road, Enfield, Middlesex; pp. 137; £1.50.

"Catholic state secondary schools — strongholds of authoritarianism — agree? Then please write Box . . .". This modest little item appeared recently in the personal columns of the *Times*. When the writer showed it to a teaching sister who has spent a lifetime at the black-board, her immediate comment was, "Some crackpot probably". He was tempted also to send to the box number a copy of the book whose title is given above and which he was studying at the time. He was prevented from doing so by the publisher's date embargo. For one of the main theses of this excellent work edited by Dr. Rhodes Boyson is precisely that education in this country is steadily deteriorating in its standards on account of a lack of authority at all levels — from the Ministry down to the classrooms. An abdication of positive leadership is at present going hand in hand with an obsession with "liberty" and "equality": a *trahison des éducateurs*.

Like all nationalised industries, our system of state schools would appear to be going bankrupt. But the alarming thing is that, whereas monetary bankruptcy of mines, railways, power or post can be put right by the injection of a few million pounds of taxpayers' money, educational bankruptcy is not easily countered: it concerns people, a whole generation. As a nationalised industry with a politician at its head it can become a political tool, a social

bulldozer. And the welfare school has come into being to slot into the Welfare State, with the direct and inevitable erosion of parental interest and authority. It is sad and all too symptomatic to observe that almost universally attendance at parents open days and evenings thins out as one goes up the school. Equal opportunities for all is a fine and Christian principle, so long as we do not become hysterical and unreasonable about it. We prefer "To each according to his need; from each according to his ability" as a sounder and more discerning principle in education. In education, we have to recognise the "dance of the chromosomes" and the "gene factor" (1). Irreparable damage to the individual can be done by leading him up the garden path of *égalité*, dangling unreachable moons before naturally ill-equipped children. Too often one sees the painful chip on the shoulders of disillusioned young men and women, who have been hounded through their schooling by starry-eyed and eager pedagogues with the whip of, "We're all equal". Surely it is better for even the young to realise their own limitations. The growing problem of truancy, probably as bad in Catholic schools as any others, indicates the efficiency of the new theories. Bitterly the teen-agers give up to go and swell the ranks of the tens of thousands of the 47 varieties of skinheads and "the mob", including even the hippies. It is rebellion against the system; and it is today's system, not yesterday's. The skinheads of *The Paint House* (2) sneered at their own comprehensive for trying to make their own pupils equal: "That's theory, isn't it, while in practice it ain't". Nevertheless, the rebels against the establishment conclude the book loyally, "It is through equality

(1) The reader is referred to a very interesting and significant extract from an article entitled "Genetics and Education, a Second Look" by Professor Arthur Jensen in *The New Scientist* of October 12th, 1972.

(2) Cf. *The Paint House*, a Fontana Educational; 30p. This is a sad book recording only too faithfully the views and opinions in their own gormless language of a group of London skinheads on various topics, including schools. One wonders whether all this commercial attention and publicity given by the media to the frequently jejune and immature doctrines of teen-agers is not becoming a sterile and almost morbid cult.

we get rid of class and exploitation". Up the egalitarians! But is not all this putting the cart before the horse? Surely equality is the end, not the means. Nor is it a physical thing, something exclusively to do with structures. Social equality stems from the heart. The operative word is "exploitation". For, in the last analysis, the real and, indeed, only objection to class distinction would appear to lie in the abuse by one class of its advantages, be they silver spoons, property or bank balances, brains or academic distinction, even trade-union power to the detriment and human envy of another class. This is exploitation. Juggling with school buildings, time-tables, curricula and names and tabs may help. But of itself it cannot achieve the eradication of exploitation. The change of men's hearts can only be achieved by direct and *authoritative* teaching and example in school and home. If this is reaching for the moon, then let us reach for it. It has been known for men to have got there. Social equality lies in social stewardship.

And so the regional comprehensive schools came to be obtained by the egalitarian social engineers out of their excessive faith in structures. Academically we have nothing against the principle of comprehension. But the circumstances of architecture, catchment and staffing have to be right; the very size and complexity of the comprehensive school make it a dangerous thing to experiment with. But forcing it into every nook and cranny — often regardless of the opinions of local and dedicated experts — by social reformers is another matter. As long as the comprehensive system is regarded primarily as a device for social rather than educational reform it can never fulfil its potential. Indeed, as an instrument for eliminating class distinction, it contains within itself the germs of frustration. For what is going to happen — in fact, is already happening — is that a few of the regional comprehensives with head-starts on the rest, for one reason or another, will attract to their catchments the "better class of children" whose parents are rich enough and self-sacrificing enough to line the pockets of the landlords and developers in the region,

who will very soon realise they are on to a good thing. And other regional comprehensives will be left to do the best they can after the cream has been whipped off in their own depreciating areas. As a result of the present near-fanatical preoccupation with structural social equality and social mobility, both of which exist already in this country to quite a high degree, we are to abolish streaming and have thrown to us instead the alternative sop of "setting". This involves a chaotic kind of musical chairs from classroom to classroom half-a-dozen times in an already short school day of less than six class hours, losing in the process at least half-an-hour a day of precious teaching time; a percentage sufficient to raise the hair of any time-and-motion consultant. And all through this educational charade, we find that most of the boys and girls know which side of the fence they are on, sixth form or no sixth form: they know it and many work and behave accordingly. So, now, the back-room boys are making ready their next move — get rid of all public examinations. The inverted Gilbert's Law will be made to prevail: "When nobody's anybody, then everybody's somebody"! Perish those genes!

But what, the reader will be asking, has all this got to do with Catholic schools as "strongholds of authoritarianism" — to quote once again from the advertisement in the personal column of the *Times*? You have here, of course, two loaded words, particularly the second. Authoritarianism evokes a resonance like totalitarianism, sectarianism, even dogmatism. The note is pejorative. On the whole, Catholic schools have submitted loyally, if reluctantly, to the state system in this country. The alternative was impossible without intolerable financial burdens and, in all likelihood, the imposition of handicaps on Catholic children. Thus, despite the action of enlightened heads and governors in the impressive Catholic system of state schools, the millenarians ⁽³⁾ have been able to buy their way in.

(3) "Millenarian" is the term given by Professor Richard Lynn in his essay in the book under review in this article, to those people in education whom Samuel Brittain, the economist, dubs "doctrinaire egalitarians".

Yet, history has shown us again and again that any blinkered obsession with *égalité* even with *liberté*, pleads almost inevitably to the tumbrils and what might be described as the authoritative destruction of authority. In man's fallen state, equality and liberty too easily result in no more than a slide into anarchy. But must we blame the doctrinaire egalitarians for the present black-board jungle. Many experienced and knowledgeable people in the educational world would think so. Though our Catholic state schools have manfully and, to some extent, successfully resisted this erosion of authority and discipline within their walls, it must be admitted that many of them could hardly be described as strongholds of the principle of authority. The ukase on the compulsory raising of the school-leaving age, which has emanated from the obscure fastnesses of educational power, applies to Catholic state schools as to any other: the local headmaster is left with no authority whatsoever in the matter of deciding who and how; another brick, in other words, removed from the base of his tottering tower of authority. More and more the men and women who actually teach are left with reduced initiative, responsibility and authority.

It is possible that the person who put the advertisement in the *Times*, which headed this review-article, was thinking in terms of that other witch-word of the humanists — "indoctrination". Once again, this is a word which has been given quite undeserved under-an-over-tones. It presents itself to the mind against a back-drop of prisoners-of-war camps, bright dazzling lights, cacophonic and unendurable sounds. But, when we view the word rationally, we realise that all viable education must involve building on a firm foundation of authoritative indoctrination. The alternative is fantasy and shifting sand. The word "indoctrination" comes from the Latin "*docere*", which means to teach. But here comes that ugly word "authority" — the red rag to the pink egalitarian. We are served up with all that euphoric cant about "*educere*" meaning "to draw out". Many of us who have spent a lifetime in education

know well that there is precious little to draw out unless we first authoritatively put something in. One of the less salubrious parts of that curate's egg, the *Plowden Report*, lays down this amazing general principle: "Finding out", has proved better for children than "being told". A very dangerous half-truth, and there rears up before us the ugly head of play-way, "discovery", free discipline and all the other theories so liable to abuse, which threaten our educational standards. We are not in any way decrying the arousing of interest, initiative and curiosity in the young as a valuable aid in the process of educating them. But all the time there must be firm and, therefore, authoritative presentation of basic facts and guidance together with authoritative insistence on learning, work and concentration; even of good manners, respect and reverence (the fifth R). There must remain, despite the pressures put on us by the egalitarian fantasies of the social engineers, teaching in class and a back bone of chalk-and-talk. If we can preserve these essential factors in our Catholic schools, joyfully and unashamedly we can agree that our schools are at least rearguards of authoritarianism. But can we all?

As education is often quite justly described as a preparation for life, and as we Christians believe that we all have in a true sense two overlapping lives — one from womb to tomb, the temporal and the other to do with the Kingdom, the eternal — it follows that Catholic education must embrace both. But, of the two, we believe, in theory at least, that the second is infinitely more important. The full life, the glossy career, whatever we call it, is only a means — and not the only means as countless saints, canonised and uncanonised have proved in their lives — to the eternal plentitude of the Beatific Vision. Authoritative teaching, training and guidance by word and example in the doctrine of Christ's Church is absolutely essential. Doctrine needs indoctrination. Play-ways and "finding out" are just not good enough, else why did the Word Incarnate found a Church at all? We have only to attend a pad

or a pop festival to realise and feel compassion for the results of "finding out" without authoritative and firm direction, the consequence of the insidious campaign against authority which has for a generation been relentlessly waged by humanists and others in the sheep's clothing of trendy new educational mystiques. And, more serious perhaps, anti-authority has seeped into the most important subject in the Catholic School's time-table. If one rejects partially the teaching authority of the Church,, one has less to "teach"; thus the sad cry from so many Catholic teachers that they do not know what to teach. So the Head often has to go out into the highways and byways looking for staff who are even willing to take religion classes; which, of course, means that the number of religious periods tends to be cut down. Four to five periods each week for physical education — and two for religious education. Specialists for the former, usually none for the latter. What was only a generation ago called "religious doctrine" must now be called "religious education". Is there any significance here? It is even called "divinity" in the more trendy schools, a title safely conveying the minimum of meaning in the context. Informality must be the keynote — a happy get-together, with a faint atmosphere of religion. No homework, no learning "by rote" (a loaded phrase; we prefer to say "by heart"), no dictation, no chalk-and-talk; just interminable and often unproductive discussion larded here and there with yankee-accented tapes.

And we all know that to teach by discussion is one of the most difficult of techniques, requiring considerable preparation and a personal flair. If not done well, it can even be dangerous. So, we can be prepared to find in some of our secondary schools that thirteen and fourteen-year-olds, after six or seven years of so-called Catholic schooling, cannot tell us how many sacraments there are, let alone what they really are and what part they play in the economy of their Church. And we must not talk too much about sacrifice, it smacks of paganism and in any case involves

acknowledging the *authority* of the Creator. So, the emphasis in the Mass is deliberately shifted to the "common meal" aspect.

The recent General Catechetical Directory issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy at the request of the Holy Father has, on the whole, been received in this country with a certain frigidity, only too obvious among some of the catechetical millenarians. Its initial reference to "traditional" Faith and the subsequent forty pages of authoritative and clear summary of its content are, perhaps, too redolent of indoctrination, so far as they are concerned. It exhorts all those who teach religious doctrine to use every suitable, modern educational device, but it warns us of the usefulness of clear and authoritative definition and the mastering of formulae. And yet the old catechism, banished on the plea that it is old-fashioned and misleading in its other-century terminology, remains in the dog-house in many of our own schools. There, the higher educational echelons apparently do not believe in the authority of their class masters or the principle of subsidiarity and insult their teachers by assuming that they are not capable of any explanation or adaptation on their own initiative. Again, at the suggestion of the Directory, other catechisms are being worked out at local level and sent back for approval to the Congregation for the Clergy in Rome. But it is significant, perhaps, that, of the two score or so of draft local catechisms that had been sent in, Cardinal John Wright told us last summer that, in his opinion, the one from Ghana was easily the best. But it always remains one thing to compose a catechism and quite another to break down the absurd prejudice against authoritative pin-pointing and learning by rote which has been so assiduously worked up by the "experts", many of whom have had very little experience of walking the educational beat — the day-to-day grind in the class-room — choosing instead the less exhausting but more prestigious work of lecturing to adults.

And so we bring the wheel full circle. The question was:

"Catholic state secondary schools — strongholds of authoritarianism — agree"? The schools themselves can answer this question by the action they take within the strict limits imposed upon them by some of the starry-eyed social (and catechetical) engineers behind the lines. But taking a cool look and prescinding from the nasty connotations of the tendentious words used in the question, some of us may find ourselves forced to answer: "We only wish that in so many cases they were more so; 'rear-guards' at least".

Guy Brinkworth, S.J.

NHS Costs and Drug Companies

Manufacturers of the antibiotic tetracycline have offered to repay £55 millions in an attempt to settle law-suits from 76 American states, cities, and counties which claim that the companies conspired to 'fix' the price of the drug, and so grossly overcharged.

But no money has been offered to British users of the drug. A spokesman for Pfizer said: "There can be no question of our making any refunds to the National Health Service." It is alleged that the 'excess' profits made in 1961, 1962, and 1963 amounted to £15 millions.

Brian Inglis, who in his book *Drugs, Doctors and Disease* (1956) first revealed the scandal of the tetracycline drug, said recently, "I realise that they did not act illegally in this country, but would it not be a gesture for Pfizer and the rest to put back into the NHS some of what they extracted?"